

ITP XXXXXX
SISSA xx/93/EP
hep-th/9308031

THE EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL FOR THE CONFORMAL FACTOR IN THE STANDARD MODEL AND BEYOND

R. Percacci *

Institute for Theoretical Physics
University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030

Abstract

There is a general mechanism by which certain matter fields coupled to gravity can generate a nontrivial effective potential for the conformal factor of the metric. It is based on a nonstandard regularization method, with the cutoff being defined independently of the conformal factor. This mechanism produces a coupling of the matter fields to a dilaton, and a complicated interaction between matter, dilaton and metric. When it is applied to the standard model, it gives an effective potential which can be used to predict the top and Higgs masses. If the purely gravitational contribution to the potential is added, the mass of the dilaton is of the order of Planck's mass and the large hierarchy between the Planck and Fermi scales appears to be due to the smallness of the Higgs-dilaton coupling.

* *permanent address:* SISSA, via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy

It has been conjectured that the existence of a scalar dilaton might be related to the vanishing of the cosmological constant [1]. In particular, this has prompted studies of the coupling of a dilaton to the standard model [2]. Very recently, a new twist has been added to the subject: the existence of a dilaton and its classical coupling to the standard model have been derived from arguments of noncommutative geometry [3] and then, modulo some assumptions about the structure of radiative corrections, a very sharp prediction of the top quark mass was derived [4]. It is quite clear that the only role played by noncommutative geometry in this argument is to make a certain statement about the effective coupling of the dilaton to the standard model. Any theory leading to the same effective coupling will therefore also lead to the same prediction for the masses.

In this note I will show that the dilaton can arise from the coupling of the standard model to gravity, if a nonstandard regularization method is adopted. Specifically, quantum fluctuations of the matter sector induce a nontrivial effective potential for the conformal factor of the metric, which then becomes an independent variable, the dilaton. The effective potential of [4] can be derived in this way. This idea has been studied before in the context of pure gravity [5]; very similar ideas have been discussed also in [6]. I will first illustrate the point in the case of a single real scalar field, since this example already has all the features of the more realistic models.

Let us therefore start from the action

$$S(\varphi, g_{\mu\nu}) = - \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\nu \varphi + \frac{1}{2} (m^2 + \xi R) \varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \varphi^4 \right] , \quad (1)$$

describing the coupling of the scalar field φ to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. We are interested in the effective dynamics induced by the scalar field for the conformal factor, so we will restrict our attention to metrics of the form

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \rho^2 \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} , \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{g}$ is some fixed metric. Defining $\phi = \rho\varphi$, the action (1) can be written as

$$S(\phi, \rho, \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}) = - \int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{g}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi + \frac{1}{2} (m^2 \rho^2 + \xi \bar{R}) \phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi^4 + \dots \right] , \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{R}$ is the Ricci scalar of the metric $\bar{g}$ and the ellipses indicate terms containing derivatives of ρ . This form of the action is invariant under the transformations

$$\bar{g}'_{\mu\nu} = \omega^2 \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} , \quad \rho' = \omega^{-1} \rho , \quad \phi' = \omega^{-1} \phi . \quad (4)$$

The classically equivalent action (1) is invariant under these transformations in a trivial way, since the combinations $g_{\mu\nu}$ and φ are not affected at all. Thus the symmetry (4) is a “compensator” or Stückelberg type gauge invariance and there cannot be any anomaly for it, as exhaustively argued in [7]. I will call the transformations (4) “Stückelberg–Weyl” transformations and reserve the name “Weyl” transformations for the conformal rescalings of the metric g .

In the case that the scalar field is free ($\lambda = 0$, $\xi = 0$), the effective action $\Gamma(g_{\mu\nu})$ is minus one half of the logarithm of the determinant of the operator $\Delta_g + m^2$, where Δ_g is the covariant laplacian $\Delta_g = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_\mu\sqrt{g}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu$. One expects from standard quantum gravity arguments that it be of the form $\Gamma(g_{\mu\nu}) = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} [\Lambda_{\text{eff}} + \kappa_{\text{eff}}R + O(R^2)]$. In the case of a metric of the form (2) with $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ flat, the first term can be interpreted as an effective potential for the conformal factor of the form $\Lambda_{\text{eff}}\rho^4$. Invariance under the transformations (4) implies that this is the only possible form of the potential for ρ .

Let us now compute directly the one-loop effective action for constant ϕ and ρ by integrating over small fluctuations of the field ϕ in the action (3), with $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ flat. It is given by

$$\Gamma^{(1)}(\rho, \phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \ln(q^2 + H) \quad (5)$$

where $q^2 = \delta^{\mu\nu}q_\mu q_\nu$ and $H = m^2\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\phi^2$. One can now proceed as one would with any theory in flat space. The integral can be regularized by imposing the cutoff $q^2 < \Lambda^2$. Adding suitable counterterms of the form $\Lambda^2\rho^2$ and $\ln\Lambda\rho^4$ one arrives at the renormalized one-loop effective potential

$$V^{(1)}(\rho, \phi) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} H^2 \ln\left(\frac{H}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right), \quad (6)$$

where μ is a renormalization mass.

This effective potential is not simply of the form that one expected: In particular when $\lambda = 0$ it does not simply become quartic in ρ . Also, invariance under the transformations (4) has been broken. As explained in [5], this is due to the way in which the theory has been regulated: the cutoff procedure used above introduces a dependence on $\bar{g}$ which is not accompanied by a corresponding factor of ρ . If we used the alternative cutoff $g^{\mu\nu}q_\mu q_\nu = \rho^{-2}q^2 < \Lambda^2$, the renormalized effective potential would be purely quartic in ρ :

$$V^{(1)}(\varphi, \rho) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} h^2 \ln\left(\frac{h}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right) \rho^4, \quad (7)$$

where $h = H/\rho^2 = m^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\phi^2$. Thus it is this second regularization method which yields results in agreement with traditional quantum gravity.

The choice between the two regularization procedures is related to which one of the metrics g and $\bar{g}$ is interpreted as giving the geometry of spacetime. In fact, the geometry enters in the definition of the modulus squared of the momentum. So if the geometry is given by g , one is led to the effective potential (7), while if the geometry is given by $\bar{g}$ one arrives at the effective potential (6).

One may still worry that the logarithmic terms in (6) are an artifact of the momentum cutoff regularization, and that they could not arise if an invariant regularization was used. I will therefore now rederive the effective potential (6) using the heat kernel regularization in a curved background. This calculation is of independent interest since it gives also the form of the curvature term in the effective action.

We begin from the linearization of the action (3)

$$S_{\text{lin}}(\phi, \rho, \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \delta\phi \bar{\mathcal{O}} \delta\phi . \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{O}} = \Delta_{\bar{g}} + \xi \bar{R} + H = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} + H$ and $\Delta_{\bar{g}}$ is the covariant Laplacian in the metric $\bar{g}$. The effective action is $\Gamma(\phi, \rho, \bar{g}) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \det \bar{\mathcal{O}}$. The determinant can be defined through the formula

$$\ln \det \bar{\mathcal{O}} = - \int_{\frac{1}{\Lambda^2}}^{\infty} ds s^{-1} \text{Tr} e^{-s\bar{\mathcal{O}}} , \quad (9)$$

where Λ is an ultraviolet cutoff. In order to extract the exact dependence of Γ on constant ρ and ϕ we write $e^{-s\bar{\mathcal{O}}} = e^{-s\tilde{\mathcal{O}}} e^{-sH}$ and use the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel of $\Delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}}$. Then the r.h.s. of (9) becomes

$$- \int_{\frac{1}{\Lambda^2}}^{\infty} ds \int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \left(b_0(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) e^{-sH} s^{-3} + b_2(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) e^{-sH} s^{-2} + b_4(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) e^{-sH} s^{-1} + \dots \right) . \quad (10)$$

The integration over s can be performed explicitly (see section 5 in [8]). Using a suitable renormalization scheme one arrives at the effective action

$$\Gamma^{(1)}(\phi, \rho, \bar{g}) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \left[-H^2 \left(\ln \frac{H}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{1}{6} - \xi \right) \bar{R} H \left(\ln \frac{H}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) + \dots \right] , \quad (11)$$

where the ellipses stand for terms quadratic in $\bar{R}$. We see that when $\bar{g}$ is flat the potential (6) is reproduced.

If the same calculation is performed starting from the action (1), the relevant operator is $\mathcal{O} = \Delta_g + h$, and one arrives at an effective action $\Gamma(\varphi, g_{\mu\nu})$ which is identical to (11) except for the replacement of H , $\bar{g}$ and $\bar{R}$ by h , g and R . In this effective action ρ only appears within the metric g . When $\bar{g}$ is flat and ρ is constant, the effective potential (7) is reproduced.

As in the case of the flat space calculations with cutoff, the choice between the two quantization procedures depends on whether g or $\bar{g}$ is interpreted as the geometric metric. In fact in the heat kernel regularization one isolates the divergences by looking at the coincidence limit of a Green function with the distance between the points measured with respect to a certain geometry. In the first calculation, this geometry was given by $\bar{g}$, and this led to the appearance of a nontrivial potential for ρ , in the second calculation it was given by g and the effective potential is given just by a cosmological term.

To summarize the discussion up to this point, we have seen that when a scalar field is coupled to gravity, there exists a way of quantizing the theory which produces a nontrivial effective potential for the scalar and the conformal factor. As a result, the invariance under the Stückelberg–Weyl transformations (4) is broken. While the classical theory depends on the variables ϕ , $\bar{g}$ and ρ only through the combinations φ and g , in the quantum theory this is no longer the case. The variable ρ , which classically can be eliminated, becomes an independent dilaton field. This is similar to the effect of the conformal anomaly [9],

but it should not be confused with it. (Note that the conformal anomaly is proportional to curvature invariants, whereas the effect discussed here is present already in flat space). Strictly speaking, one should say that a theory is anomalous only when there is no way to quantize it which preserves all classical symmetries. We have seen that this theory is not anomalous. Instead, we have used a quantization procedure that “unnecessarily” breaks the Stückelberg–Weyl invariance. While it may seem more natural to choose the quantization procedure that preserves the invariance, the alternative that is proposed here does not seem at this stage to lead to any pathology and remains a viable alternative.

The results obtained for the scalar field can be generalized to other fields. A massive Dirac fermion coupled to the scalar φ has an action equal to

$$\int d^4x \sqrt{g} \bar{\chi} (D_g + m + h\varphi) \chi , \quad (12)$$

where $D_g = \gamma^a \theta_a^\mu D_\mu$ is the Dirac operator in the metric g , θ_a^μ is the inverse vierbein for g and h is a Yukawa coupling. Defining $\theta^a_\mu = \rho \bar{\theta}^a_\mu$ and $\psi = \rho^{3/2} \chi$, the action can be rewritten as

$$\int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \bar{\psi} (D_{\bar{g}} + m\rho + h\phi + \dots) \psi , \quad (13)$$

where the ellipses indicate terms involving derivatives of ρ . The fermionic contribution to the effective action for constant ϕ and ρ is

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln \det(\Delta_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{4} \bar{R} + F) = \frac{4}{64\pi^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \left[F^2 \left(\ln \frac{F}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{6} \bar{R} F \left(\ln \frac{F}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) + \dots \right], \quad (14)$$

where $F = (m\rho + h\phi)^2$. Note that when $m = 0$ the action is invariant under rescalings of the metric and accordingly the contribution to the effective potential is independent of ρ .

Similarly in the case of gauge fields, due to the Weyl invariance of the Yang–Mills action, the effective potential depends only on scalar fields and not on ρ . For example in the case of an abelian gauge field coupled to a complex scalar ϕ the contribution to the effective potential in the Landau gauge is

$$-\frac{1}{2} \ln \det(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\nu^\mu + \delta_\nu^\mu Z) = \frac{3}{64\pi^2} \int d^4x \left[-Z^2 \left(\ln \frac{Z}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{6} \bar{R} Z \left(\ln \frac{Z}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) + \dots \right], \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\nu^\mu = \delta_\nu^\mu \Delta_{\bar{g}} + \bar{R}_\nu^\mu$ and $Z = g^2 \phi^2$ is the effective mass squared of the gauge field.

In equations (11), (14) and (15) we have assumed that $\bar{R}$ is small compared to H , F and Z respectively. Thus the terms of order $\bar{R}$ represent the effect of a weak background gravitational field on the effective potential.

Let us now come to the standard model. As in [1,2,4] we are going to consider the possible presence of a term proportional to ρ^4 . We assume that the potential term in the action has the form $-\int d^4x \sqrt{g} \frac{\lambda}{4!} (|\varphi|^2 - a^2)^2$, where φ is now a complex Higgs doublet. This can be rewritten $-\int d^4x \sqrt{\bar{g}} V^{(0)}$, where

$$V^{(0)} = \frac{\lambda}{4!} (|\phi|^2 - \rho^2 a^2)^2 . \quad (16)$$

Putting together the contributions of the Higgs fields, the gauge fields and the fermions, the one-loop effective potential has the form

$$V^{(1)} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \left[H^2 \left(\ln \frac{H}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + 3G^2 \left(\ln \frac{G}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + 6W^2 \left(\ln \frac{W}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + 3Z^2 \left(\ln \frac{Z}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) - 12T^2 \left(\ln \frac{T}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \right], \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{\lambda}{6}(3\phi^2 - a^2\rho^2), & G &= \frac{\lambda}{6}(\phi^2 - a^2\rho^2), \\ W &= \frac{1}{4}g_2^2\phi^2, & Z &= \frac{1}{4}(g_2^2 + g_1^2)\phi^2, & T &= \frac{1}{2}h^2\phi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

One can use the potential $V^{(0)} + V^{(1)}$ and the known values of ϕ^2 , W and Z to rederive the prediction of the top and Higgs masses that was given in [4]. The one-loop term (17) differs from the result given in [4] in the numerical coefficients of the gauge field contributions. This is due to the different renormalization conditions and should be irrelevant if the appropriate values of ϕ^2 , W and Z are used.

We now discuss the induced action for the metric $\bar{g}$. The coefficient of $\sqrt{\bar{g}}\bar{R}$ in the effective action is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{64\pi^2} & \left[\frac{1}{3}H \left(\ln \frac{H}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) + G \left(\ln \frac{G}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) - W \left(\ln \frac{W}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{2}Z \left(\ln \frac{Z}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{2}{3}T \left(\ln \frac{T}{\mu^2} - 1 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Thus the induced action for $\bar{g}$ is not simply an Einstein–Hilbert term. Rather, we have a complicated interaction between the Higgs field, the dilaton and the metric, which is more similar to a Brans–Dicke type of action. However, at momentum scales much smaller than the Higgs mass, the coefficient of $\bar{R}$ can be treated as essentially constant, thus leading to an Einstein–Hilbert effective action for $\bar{g}$ [8]. Unfortunately, this cannot be the whole story, since the v.e.v. of (19) is of the order of the W mass squared and thus cannot be identified as the coefficient of $\bar{R}$ in the whole gravitational action.

If the Einstein–Hilbert term is to be obtained as an induced action, it must receive contributions from other sectors of the theory. I will briefly discuss here the possible contribution of the gravitational sector, which was computed in [5] starting from a gauge theory of gravity with lagrangian quadratic in curvature and torsion. There is no potential at tree level, and the one-loop term depends only on ρ :

$$V^{(1)} = \frac{9}{64\pi^2} e^4 \rho^4 \left(\ln \frac{e^2 \rho^2}{\mu'^2} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (20)$$

where e is the gauge coupling constant of the Lorentz connection and μ' is another renormalization mass. Similarly, the coefficient of $\bar{R}$ will be of the order of $e^2 \rho^2$. We can

therefore interpret the induced $\bar{R}$ term as the whole gravitational action if the v.e.v. of ρ is of the order of Planck's mass.

In principle the v.e.v of ρ is the minimum of the total potential obtained summing (16), (17) and (20). However, the natural way to obtain v.e.v.s for ρ and ϕ of the order of the Planck and Fermi scale respectively, is to have the coupling constant a very small. Then, the dependence on ρ in (16) and (17) can be neglected with respect to (20) and the expectation value of ρ will be essentially equal to μ'/e , the minimum of (20). One can then insert this value in (16) and (17) and minimize with respect to ϕ ; the result will be of the order of $a\rho$ and this will fix a to be of the order of 10^{-16} . Therefore in this picture, the large hierarchy between the Planck and the Fermi scale would be due to the smallness of the coupling between Higgs and dilaton. Clearly a renormalization group analysis will be needed to make further progress in this direction. In contrast to [1,2,4], the dilaton would have a mass of the order of Planck's mass.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank R. Floreanini and L. Griguolo for important contributions to the point of view presented here. I also wish to thank G. Horowitz, J. Madore and R. Woodard for conversations and comments. This work is supported by INFN and also by the National Science Foundation under grant No. PHY89-04035.

References

- [1] R.D. Peccei, J. Solà and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **195**, 183, (1987);
C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **302**, 668 (1988);
S.M. Barr and D. Hochberg, Phys. Lett. B **211**, 49 (1988);
G.D. Coughlan, I. Kani, G.G. Ross and G. Segrè, Nucl. Phys. B **316**, 469 (1989);
E.T. Tomboulis, Nucl. Phys. B **329**, 410 (1990).
- [2] W. Buchmüller and N. Dragon, Phys. Lett B **195**, 417 (1987);
W. Buchmüller and N. Dragon, Nucl. Phys. B **321**, 207 (1989);
W. Buchmüller and C. Busch, Nucl. Phys. B **349**, 71 (1991).
- [3] A. Chamseddine, G. Felder and J. Fröhlich, "Gravity in non-commutative geometry", ZU-TH-30/1992 (to appear in Comm. Math. Phys).
- [4] A. Chamseddine and J. Fröhlich, "Constraints on the Higgs and top quark masses from effective potential and noncommutative geometry", ZU-TH-16/1993.
- [5] R. Floreanini and R. Percacci, "Average effective potential for the conformal factor", SISSA 71/93/EP, hep-th/9305172.
- [6] E. Elizalde and S.D. Odintsov, "Gravitational phase transitions in infrared quantum gravity", Hiroshima preprint HUPD-92-10;
A.A. Bytsenko, E. Elizalde and S.D. Odintsov, "The renormalization group and effective potential in curved spacetime with torsion", HUPD-93.
- [7] N.C. Tsamis and R.P. Woodard, Ann. of Phys. **168**, 457 (1986).
- [8] R. Floreanini and R. Percacci, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1566 (1992).
- [9] I. Antoniadis and E. Mottola, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2013 (1992).